

### REMARKS

Claims 1-11 remain in this application. Claims 1-10 were amended in this response. New claim 11 was added. No new matter has been introduced as a result of the amendments. A formal set of drawings are also included in this response.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by *Lev et al.* (US Patent 5,608,779). Applicant traverses these rejections. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Specifically, *Lev* does not teach “converting the voice information, dependent on an event, in the mobile radio network into a transcoded format; processing the voice information further to incorporate the event into voice information data; and converting the voice information into a non-transcoded format” as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 8 and 11.


*Lev* discloses a GSM architecture where external transcoding equipment (121-123) transmits PCM coded speech data between switches (col. 3, lines 45-62). *Lev* teaches that the switching center and the transcoders communicate in a non-compressed format, while the mobile units transceive information in the form of compressed digital voice (col. 3, lines 45-62). Depending on the operating mode (transcoding, transparent), the site controller or switching center knows to convert compressed data to non-compressed data, and vice-versa (col. 5, lines 13-43). However, *Lev* does not disclose processing the voice information further to incorporate the event into voice information data, and converting the voice information into a non-transcoded format. While the Office Action has interpreted “event” in *Lev* as meaning operating mode, this interpretation does not match the features recited in the present claims. As the present claims require incorporating/importing of the event into the voice data itself, this feature is not taught nor suggested by *Lev*.

Furthermore, in new claim 11 (similarly in claim 2), the event features are further defined as a request for importing announcement data, tone data or other data into the transmitted voice information. This feature also is not taught nor suggested by *Lev*.

Should the Examiner maintain the current rejections, Applicants respectfully request an Examiner Interview on the matter, and reserve the rights therein. The Examiner is also encouraged to contact the undersigned to arrange an Interview, if appropriate.

In light of the above amendments and arguments, Applicants submit that claims 1-11 are allowable. Applicants respectfully submit that the patent application is in condition for allowance and request a Notice of Allowance be issued. A petition for a one-month extension of time, along with a check in the amount of \$120.00 is enclosed herein. The Commissioner is authorized to charge and credit Deposit Account No. 02-1818 for any additional fees associated with the submission of this Response. Please reference docket number 112740-259.

Respectfully submitted,  
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLC

BY   
Peter Zura  
Reg. No. 48,196  
P.O. Box 1135  
Chicago, Illinois 60690-1135  
Phone: (312) 807-4208

Dated: February 7, 2005